


SHIPMAIN

Module 4: Resource Sponsor & Decision Board Operations

Decision Point 1 - O6 Review Board

Authorize Funding for Preliminary Engineering

Voting steps are same for Phase II, III




Ref: 3049aUS

Decision Point 1 - 1 / 2 Star Review Board Authorize Funding for Preliminary Engineering

Voting steps are same for Phase
II, III

In




Ref: 3049aUS

Decision Point 1 - 3 Star Review Board

Authorize Funding for Preliminary Engineering

Voting steps are same for Phase II, III



Ref: 3049aUS



The RCP Summarizes information from the SCD including AFOM and CBA calculations

Recommended Change Package (RCP) Decision Point 1

reset back export

News & Messages

Latest News

CD Menu

Pending SCDs

Add SCD

View/Edit SCDs

OM

AFOM Phase I

AFOM Phase II

AFOM Phase IIa

AFOM Phase III

CP Menu

Pending RCPs

View/Edit RCPs

Support

Version Info

Help/Support

Tech Guide

Training Guide

Report Bug

View Bug List

Contact Us

Webmaster

SHIP CHANGE

Change Tracking Number: 43 **OPEN** **Expedite Approval:** NO
Phase: PHASE I-COMPLETE **Date:** 07/19/2004
Ship Change Title: SCD Test - PEO Carriers 2
Description of Change: This is a test of the SCD web system on 7/19/04.
Applicable Classes: CV 0067, CVN 0065, CVN 0070, CVN 0071, CVN 0072, CVN 0074, CVN 0075, CVN 0076, CVN 0068, CVN 0069, CVN 0073, CVN 0077
Applicable Ships: CVN 0065, CVN 0071, CVN 0072, CVN 0074, CVN 0075, CVN 0076, CVN 0068, CVN 0069, CVN 0073, CVN 0077

Applicable Sites:

Overall AFOM Should be the primary consideration when voting; Suitability and Pillar AFOMs may help in discriminating the benefit provided by the ship change from a War fighting or Readiness Perspective

REQUIREMENTS/IMPACTS

Integrated Logistics Support (ILS)
 Networks
 Software
 Weapons Systems

AFOM

AFOM	Capability	SeaShield	SeaStrike	SeaBase	ForceNet	QOS/QOL	Suitability
1.00000							

Comments:
 Test

TAT REVIEW

This is a test of the SCD web system on 7/19/04.
 No TAT-CM comments provided

CBA **OPEN**

Cost	ROI	PayBack	NPV
6959.16	0.31	10	-1534.78

Comments:
 No comment provided

REVIEW

The RCP is only viewable by the CNO Resource Sponsor and Decision Board

Module 4(R)



- News & Messages
- Latest News
- CD Menu
- Pending SCDs
- Add SCD
- View/Edit SCDs
- OM
- AFOM Phase I
- AFOM Phase II
- AFOM Phase IIa
- AFOM Phase III
- RCP Menu
- Pending RCPs
- View/Edit RCPs
- Support
- Version Info
- Help/Support
- Tech Guide
- Training Guide
- Report Bug
- View Bug List
- Contact Us
- Webmaster

RCP Menu Only for Decision Boards/Resource Sponsors

Recommended Change

reset back export

Comments:
No comment provided

SPM REVIEW

- ☒ Recommended
- ☐ Not Recommended

Comments:
No comment provided

Resource Sponsor Funding Plans, funding approval and Decision Board Vote Tally is summarized on the lower half of the RCP

RESOURCE SPONSOR & EXECUTION PLAN

Responses: (Sponsors: 1 Yes-Responses: 0 No-Responses: 0)

Sponsor	Respondent	Date	Impact	Comments
OPNAV N610R				

Appropriations (cost per FY):

Appn Name	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
O&MN	0.0K	500.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K
O&MN	0.0K	500.0K	500.0K	200.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K
O&MN	0.0K	0.0K	500.0K	500.0K	200.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K
O&MN	500.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K	0.0K

VOTING BLOCK

Vote Tally: (Voters: 4 Recommended: 0 Not Recommended: 0)

Voter Considerations

- **Does the ship change have technical merit as indicated by the TAT and SPM recommendations?**
 - **Realistic/feasible technology to place aboard ship?**
 - **No “inherent obsolescence” e.g. ship change will not be obsolete by Decision Point 3 (Procure and Install)?**
- **AFOM and CBA:**
 - **Does the AFOM support Navy Priorities or does voter personal knowledge of a priority outweigh a “low” Overall AFOM (generally < 50th Percentile)?**
 - **Higher AFOM scores may outweigh a CBA where there is no ROI (investment in new capability)**
 - **Capability to fill “Gaps” identified in CNO Campaign Analysis/SEA Trials Process**
 - **Lower AFOM scores may be outweighed by high CBA ROI:**
 - **Examples would include TMA/TMI solutions that do not offer warfighting improvements, but reduce maintenance, workload or other “Suitability” factors**

*** Voter Review RCP**

